



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

LOCUS IN GALLO-ROMAN

In the west, Latin *cocta* became **kòχta* < **kòξta*,¹ and likewise *coxa* developed through **kòχsa* to **kòξsa*.² French has *p* in *cep* < *cippu*, beside *f* < *v* < *b* < *p* in *chef*, with a loss of final *o* later than the change of *p* to *v* between vowels.³ It is therefore probable that *locus* and *locōs* developed through **lògos* to *lòks* in Provençal, which shared with French the general voicing of intervocalic occlusives. The form *lòks* was contemporary with **kòχsa* in southern France. After *coxa* had changed to **kòχsa*, no simple Provençal word contained the sound-group *ks*, aside from *lòks* and other such forms with inflectional *s*. The new *ks* of *lòks* was partially protected by the *k* of *lòk*, but nevertheless it was widely changed to *χs*. This repetition of the development *χs* < *ks*, apparently several centuries later than the formation of medial *χs*, has parallels in French *frêne* < *fraisne* beside Latin *pōno* < **posno*, and Spanish *estao* < *estado* beside older *veis* < *veedes* < *uidētis*.

In the Hispanic languages, open vowels were commonly changed to closer sounds by contact with following palatals, and also under the influence of vowel-harmony.⁴ These two general principles governed the alteration of *è* and *ò* in Provençal likewise, but here the closure was fractural, not total as in Hispanic. Thus *ie* was developed in the derivatives of *lectu* > **lèχto* > **lèξt*, *melius* > **mèλλos*, *peior* (usually spelled *peior* and often wrongly supposed to have long *e*),⁵ because of palatal-contact; and in the derivatives of *herī*, *meu*, *seruio*, because of harmonic change, after stressless *i* and *u* had become close in contact with other vowels. A diphthong written *uo* or *ue* was developed in the derivatives of *cocta* > **kòξta*, **posseo* > **pòššo* (afterward replaced by *poss' ego* > **pòsko*, with *uo*

¹ *Modern Language Review*, VIII, 492.

² I use the following special symbols: *χ* = German *ch* in *acht*; *γ* = Dutch *g* in *dagen*; *ξ* = German *ch* in *echt*; *λ* = Portuguese *lh*; *u* and *ō* as in German. A grave accent marks stressed vowels that are open, an acute those that are close.

³ Final *b* would have become *p*, in accord with *vent* < *uēndo*.

⁴ *Modern Philology*, XI, 347.

⁵ Stolz-Schmalz, *Lat. Grammatik*, München, 1910, p. 50.

borrowed from **puois*), **vόλλo*, because of palatal-contact; and in the derivatives of **bόvi* (nom. pl.), *moueo* < **mόvio*, **όffrio*, because of harmonic change.

If evidence of early vowel-breaking is shown in the modern border-form *niau* for ordinary Provençal *nόu* < *noue*, we can admit the influence of French (**nūov* > **niόu* > *niau*), as in Mistral's *chin* for *can*; or perhaps *noue* sometimes became **nόvi* instead of **nόv* before a vowel, and thus acquired a diphthong by harmonic change. The reduction of *noue* and **nόvo* to *nόu* was too late to produce a development like that of *meu* > *mieu*. Beside pre-literary Provençal **nόvi* < *nouī*, there were forms with endings that would not produce harmonic change: *nόva*, *nόvas*, **nόvo*, **nόvos*. The majority favored the simple vowel, and this is why we generally find *nόu* (or *nau* < *nόu*) as the modern form of the adjective. The variant *niau* (< *nūiou*) seems to imply analogic alteration of **nόvo* or *nόu*, due to **nuovi* (< **nόvi*) or its derivative. In the same way *suegre*, an early variant of *sogre* < *soc(e)ru*, can be explained as corresponding to Latin *soc(e)rī* or *socrūs*. There is no good ground for thinking that any occlusive caused *ό* to become a diphthong in early Provençal. Even the palatal affricate that was developed from *k*, in a form between **kόket* and *cotz*, did not have the fractural power shown by *λ* in **fόλλα* < *fuolha*.

Provençal **lόxs* developed through **lόξs* to **luois*, in accordance with the derivatives of **kόχta* and **kόχsa*. The *uo* of **luois* was often extended by analogy to the derivative of *locu*, so that we find forms written *luoc* and *luec* beside normal *loc* in early Provençal. And conversely the *i* of **luois* was replaced by analogic *k*. These stem-changes have numerous parallels in Romanic speech-history. Mistral's dialect uses as a singular the historic plural *bίdu* < *būdu* < **buovi* < **bόvi*, beside *nόu* < *noue*, *nόu* < **nόvo*, whereas Catalan *bόu* < *boue* corresponds to *nόu* < *noue*, *nόu* < **nόvo*. A more remarkable change is seen in Genoese *fonzo*, with the sound *z* that belongs to its plural *fonzi* < *fungī*. If Tuscan *fungo* is not bookish, beside *tronco* < *truncu*, its *u* was borrowed from the derivative of *fungī*, which would have developed *ú* from *ù* because of early palatal-contact. So too Portuguese *fungo* may owe its *u* to a lost derivative of *fungī*. Spanish has *nudo*, against Portuguese *noo* < *nόdu*, with analogic *u*

taken from the derivative of *nōdī*. A complex development is found in Spanish *vosco* beside *vosco*: the latter represents *uōs* with the suffix of *uōbīscu*, while the former apparently contains **vus* < **vuves* < *uōbīs*, combined with the same suffix.

Spoken Walloon has *nu* < *nūdu* and *nūf* < *noue*: *ūo* contracted to *ū*, just as *ie* did to *ī* in *kwīr* < **kwīer* < *quaero*.¹ Where Latin *ū* became *ū*, the treatment of *uo* depended on the relative dates of *ū* > *ū* and *ō* > *uo*. In southern France, outside of the Gascon region, the formation of *uo* was generally so early that it became *ūo* or *ūe*, corresponding to *ū* < *ū*. As *ūo* was dissimilated to *ūe* in Castilian, we might assume *ūo* > *ūe* > *ūe* for some of the Provençal dialects; modern *ūe* is found in southern Provence. But Provençal speech has the sound *e* in *autre* < *alteru*, *katre* < **kwattro*, *mèrle* < *merulu*, so that *ūo* > *ūe* could have been a normal development when the stress was on *ū*. Mistral's *iō* is presumably derived from an older *ūe* through *ūō*: the sound *e* is kept in *pièi* (< *pūeis*) because of the following *i*.²

In southern Languedoc, *ūo* has become *iō*, parallel with *sūau* > *siau*. Thus the derivatives of *folia*, *hodie*, *locu*, *longe*, *nocte*, and *oculu* are written *fiolha*, *ioi*, *lioc*, *lion*, *nioch*, *iol*, in Langlade's *Poésies languedociennes* (Montpellier, 1906). For this region analogic *lioga*, beside normal *loga* < *loca*, needs no special explanation. Where *ūo* regularly made *ūō* or *ūe*, the form *lōk* caused *lūok* and *lūoga* to regain their *o*-sound. Thus Mistral's dialect has *ō* in *liō* and *liogo*, beside *ō* in the derivative of *folia* (borrowed from French?) and *iō* generally elsewhere.

In Switzerland and the neighboring portions of France, where consonants are treated mainly as in the north, some of the modern dialects have *fwa* meaning 'fire,' and this form occurs in the same dialect as *lwa* 'place,' *kwé* < *coriu*, *kwèt* < *coctu*.³ Free *ō*, for example that of *boue*, has not usually produced a diphthong in the *fwa*-region, so we may assume *lwa* < **lōis* < *lōχs* < **lōγos* < **lōgos*. The difference between *lwa* and *kwé* implies **lwé* beside **kwér*: an early final *wé* became *wa*.

¹ In ordinary spelling these words are *nou*, *noúf*, *qwīr*.

² Mistral writes *ue* for his *ō* and also for the *ūe* of southern Provence; and *quatre* for *katre* beside *caire* for *kaire* < *quadru*.

³ *Revue des patois gallo-romans*, I, 178-79.

In northern France we find *grieu* < **griewo* < **grieyo* < *græcu* beside *rover* < **rowar* < **roγar* < *rogāre*: final *o* was lost before *w* changed to *v*. *Veraï* seems to be a derivative of *uēr'* *aio*; ¹ *ami* could have come from **amiü* < **amiu* < **amiwo*, with assimilation as in *āie* < *adiūtāt*, *fiz* < **fiuts* < **fiłts*. We may therefore assume that *locu(s)* made French **luou(s)*, parallel with *græcu* > *grieu* and *cor* > **kuor*. The derivative of free *ō* is commonly spelled *oe* or *ue* in early French. Where *oe* is written, we can assume that the scribe's pronunciation was *ue* or *uō*, probably with the stress on the second vowel. But the *i* of *lieu* indicates *üe* or *üō* as the diphthongal derivative of *ō*. Gascon has *oelh* (*wéλ*) corresponding to the Languedoc form *iol* < *uolh* (*üoλ*), and similar variations existed in the north. The French sound *ü* is kept in *cuit* < **küeit* < *coctu*: from *lit* < **lieit* < **lieǵt* < **lèǵt* < *lectu* we know that free *è* gave the same result as *ē* before a palatal in French, and it seems clear that this principle applies to the derivatives of *ō* also.

In § 75 of his French grammar (Heidelberg, 1908), Meyer-Lübke says that *ueu* became *eu* after a labial or velar sound, and was changed to *ieu* by dissimilation otherwise. This theory of *lieu* is hardly reasonable. In Portuguese *luta* < *luita* < *lucta* and Rumanian *închide* = Italian *inchiude*, we find assimilative interchanges of *i* and *u*. But are there any examples of dissimilative *i* < *u* or *u* < *i* in Romanic speech-history? We have no right to assume dissimilation in Portuguese *coisa* for *cousa* < *causa*: here the development of *oi* was analogic, arising from a normal interchange in assimilative formations like *couro* < *coiro* < *coriu*, *noute* < *noite* < *nocte*.

The sounds *i* and *u* are as widely separated as either is from *a*. A change of *e* to *a* or *i* is natural enough; but can we admit the possibility of **irare* < *arāre*, **vida* < *uīdī*, as dissimilative developments? This possibility is implied by Meyer-Lübke's theory of *lieu*. Meyer-Lübke seems to confuse *ueu* with *üeu*: he says that the theory of *ieu* < *ueu* was originated by Foerster (*Aiol*, p. lii). If we look into the matter, we find that Foerster assumes *üè* < *ō* and *ièu* < *üèu*; also that Meyer-Lübke (§ 55) is acquainted with the *üè* assumed elsewhere by Foerster. It may be well to add that the words *cointe* and *loin* cannot properly be brought into the discussion.

¹ *Romania*, XXXV, 121.

The French derivatives of *cognitu* and *longe* acquired close *o*, by reason of nasal-influence, before the *o* of **fōlla* changed to *uo*.

We may assume that *o* made *uo* > *ue* > *üe* or *o* > *uo* > *üo* > *üe* in French; a weakening of stress reduced *ue* or *üe* to *e* in *avec*. Perhaps there was a diphthong *üö* earlier than *üe*, but this would not have affected the later distinction between *ö* < *üö* < *üe* and *iö* < *ieu* < *üeu*. Early French had *i* for *iei* and *üi* for *üei*. In the same way the middle sound of *üeu* tended to disappear. The first change was *üeu* > *üöu*, with labial assimilation. The next step would have normally been *üöu* > *üu*, parallel with *üei* > *üi*. It is probable that **liu* (written *liu*?) was developed, and changed to *lü* in accord with *üi* > *ü* in the derivative of *lucta*. But there was also a widespread reaction against use of *üöu*.

The development of *üöu* was earlier than the change of *üe* to *üö* otherwise, so that **kuor* > *küer* and **luou* > **lüeu* > **lüöu* came to have different stressed vowels, the stress having been displaced as in Provençal *úo* > *üè* and Spanish *úo* > *ué*. Children who said **lüöu* were corrected by their elders, and stressed *e* was restored. But *e* could not be maintained between labial vowels. As grown persons insisted on the sound *e*, children kept it by saying *lieu*. Here the *e* was between unlike vowels, and was safe for a while. The stressed vowels of *küer* and *lieu* remained the same; so did those of later *küör* and *liöü*. The form written *liu* may have been *liü* < *liöü*, or *liú* < **liú*.

If *aluec* was not borrowed from the Provençal derivative of *ad* (*illu*)*locu*, it may have come from *ad ill' hoc*. The variant *luec* is based on *aluec*; and we can explain *iluec* in the same way, or refer it to *ex ill' hoc*, with the accusative *höc* (< *hocc*) instead of the ablative *hōc*.

French *ueil* (*üe*λ) and *ieus* differ in the same way as *cuer* and *lieu*. The cause of the difference was evidently the sound *u*. We have no right to assume a formation of *ieus* from *els*, as Matzke does in the *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, XX, 10. Such a development, aside from the difficulty about the date of *ie* < *e*, would hardly be possible without a general change of *ö* to *e*. As French keeps the sound *ö* in *œil*, *cœur*, and countless other words, it is unreasonable to assume that *oculōs* became *els*, except in dialects (if there were any such) that regularly changed *ö* to *e*. It is plain that the

written *e* of *els* might be an approximate spelling of the sound *ö*, comparable to mediaeval German *ou* and *eu* for the diphthong *öü* (which has become *ai* or *oi* in modern speech, though still written *eu*). If a scribe was accustomed to writing *ue* for *üö*, and *eu* for *öu* or *öü*, in a dialect that had no *ö* outside of these diphthongs, he would naturally write *e* where he heard the simple *ö* of another dialect.

French *üe*λ developed to *ö*λ, parallel with *küer* > *kör*; *üels* made **üeus* > *ieus* > *iös*, in accord with *lieu* > *liö*.

EDWIN H. TUTTLE

NORTH HAVEN, CONN.

[As in all his work in historical linguistics, Mr. Tuttle approaches the vexed *locus* question by way of a closer analysis of the physiological factors at work. In his hands this method, which seeks a more penetrating observation of the phonetic changes involved, has produced results often extremely suggestive, notably in the field of Vulgar Latin. It may be seriously questioned, however, whether in the foregoing article he has not made too little use of historical data, and also whether he has not paid too little attention to differences of dialect.

One might also reproach Mr. Tuttle for not giving due weight and attention to those who have preceded him in his arduous quest: one would hardly gather from the preceding exposition that previous attempts to "settle the *locus* business" have been many and persistent. Ascoli, Foerster, Schwan, Gröber, Meyer-Lübke, Neumann, C. Joret, G. Paris, Suchier, Matzke, Mussafia, Voretzsch, Geijer, P. Marchot, A. Thomas, and others, have all dealt with the matter in more or less detail. The list is rather formidable.¹ "Cette question est une des plus ardues de la phonétique française," wrote G. Paris, and, unless all experience is at fault, it will be ultimately solved, as other vexed problems have been solved, by the patient collaboration of many minds, each contributing new facts, or new combinations of facts, until finally a solution is reached which is so simple and convincing that it commends itself to all. In offering the following supplement to Mr. Tuttle's article I shall be presenting, in the main, what seem to me results already achieved, as to the north French forms, in the many discussions preceding Mr. Tuttle's. I shall also seize the opportunity to

¹ For a summary of the discussion up to 1897, see Lindström, *L'Analogie dans la Déclinaison des Substantifs latins de la Gaule*, pp. 167-76, where, however, Matzke's suggestive article, *Mod. Lang. Notes*, VII, 65-69, is overlooked. Since 1897 the most important contributions which have come to my attention are: Meyer-Lübke, *Zeit. f. Frz. Spr. u. Litt.*, XXXII¹ (1908), 295; Gröber, in the *Studi letterari* dedicated to Pio Rajna (1911), p. 407; A. Thomas, *Romania*, XXIX, 585, n.

incorporate suggestions of my own, some of which I made as long ago as 1894, in a paper read before the Modern Language Association (see the *Whitney Memorial Volume*, p. 117), but never published.

The north French problem is triple: How is the apparently irregular retention of the post-tonic (*u*) in *lieu*, *feu*, *queu* to be explained? What is the relation of these forms to the adverbs *iluec*, *lués*, and to the forms *luec*, *fuec*, *cuec*, which occur, particularly in the S. W. dialects? How is the (*i*) of *lieu* (cf. *feu*, *jeu*, *queu*) to be accounted for?

Those who attack the problem of the *-δcus* group are led, if not compelled, to deal more or less with five other related groups: (a) OF *pou-peu*, *poi* paucum; *bou* 'arm-ring' G. *balg*, *baug*-; *trou* *traugus; (b) *fou*, *fay* fagus; *esclou* G. *slag*-; *sarcou*, *sarquieu* *sarquagus for sarco-phagus;¹ (c) *clou* clavus; *Angieus* Andegavis; *Peitieu* Pictavis; (d) OF *lou*, *leu* lūpus; (e) OF *jou*, western *ju* jūgum, and probably OF *cous*, western *cus* *cūgus for cūcus 'cuckoo'.² But these groups I must leave aside for the present with the remark that I hope some light will be thrown upon them by the treatment of the *-ocus* group below. Their explanation is certainly to be sought in that ever-enlarging chapter which deals with the disturbing influences of the *-s* of flexion, and in an as yet incomplete chapter of OF grammar which will deal with the solution into (*u*) of labial or labialized consonants.

As to the *lōcus* group, having in mind the close companionship of VL (*ε*) and (*ø*), we shall be on sure ground if we study the *-δcus* words side by side with caecus OF *cieus*, and with VL *sēquis*, *sēquit* OF *sieus*, *sieut*. To do this was one of Suchier's notable contributions: he was also right in insisting upon the early appearance of (*ieu*) in *lieu*. His inclusion of *lieu* and *gieu* under the rubric (*ieu*) instead of under (*ueu*) was natural and proper for an OF grammar which covers a period beginning with the year 1100.

When, therefore, we confront It. *luogo*, *cuore*, OSp. *luego*, *cuer*, with OF *cuer*, there really is no good reason to doubt the regular lengthening, in North France,³ of either (*ø*) in *lōcus* or of (*ε*) in caecus, late VL *lōgus*,

¹ In view of the V(ulgar) L(atin) aversion to intervocalic (*f*), *sarquagus and not *sarcōfus (Meyer-Lübke, *Zeit. f. rom. Phil.*, IX, 538) seems to me the correct starting-point for Fr. *cercueil*. For the unification of the group *co-a* to *qua*, *ca* one might compare Prov. *encar* inchoare (Herzog, *Zeit. f. Frz. Spr.*, XXXIV¹, 305); also Fr. *caillier*, It. *quagliare* from VL *quagulare* for *coagulare* (*ibid.*, XLI², 143). There is no need for so desperate a suggestion as Constans' *sarcōlium (*Roman de Troie*, VI, 122).

² The OF forms of this word which show a (*p*), such as *coup* (oblique case) and the derived *coupaud*, are, I believe, to be explained by an association with a fem. *coupe* *cūlpa* = *cunnus*; see E. W. Fay, *Classical Quarterly*, I, 13-15; also *Mod. Phil.*, X, 441.

³ Provençal, because it was different speech-unity, is an entirely different matter, and there may be some question as to the S. W. dialects (Poitou). Mr. Tuttle, I fear, will cause confusion by associating this lengthening with that in *dōctus*, *lōctus*: it is not clear to the reader that the two phenomena belong to different dates. See G. Paris' review of Voretzsch, *Romania*, XXIX, 585. Besides, it is anything but certain that Fr. *lit* went through the stage **lieit*.

kēgus, coinciding in all respects with the acc. pl. *lōgos*, *kēgos*.¹ With these may be associated ps. 2 and ps. 3 of *sēquēre*, later *sēguis*, *sēquit*. If now the groups *-gus*, *-gut* are resolved to *-us*, *-ut*, we shall have, strictly speaking, no infraction of the law of the finals—a matter of some importance from the point of view of theory. This is essentially the solution offered by G. Paris,² and it is unnecessary to use space to justify the passage of (*gu*) or even of (*g*) to (*u*); instances of this change are familiar enough.³ What has not hitherto been put to the test of discussion is the idea that for the groups under consideration the resolution of (*gu*) to (*u*) is conditioned upon a following dental (*s*) (*t*) (*l*),⁴ and hence took place only in the two inflected cases of the nouns and in the second and third sg. Ps. of *sēquēre*. One might select as typical the participial substantive **sēquīta* OF *sieute*,⁵ which does not share the development as to *-kt-* of *exlēcta* OF *eslute* on the one hand, nor as to *-t-* that of *laeta* VL *lēta* OF *liee* on the other; that is, in *sēquis* later *sēguis* there was both lengthening of the tonic vowel and resolution of (*gu*) to (*u*); similarly in *kēgus* and *lōgus*.

From ancient *lōgus* we should expect to pass first to **luqus* and then to **lueus*, but the latter form, as Suchier rightly insisted (notwithstanding the authority of G. Paris, who printed a supposedly archaic *lueu* in his last revision of the *St. Alexis*), is nowhere attested: the oldest central Fr. examples show *lieus*.⁶ How explain this? If we pronounce *lueus*, with

¹ There is plenty of evidence of the voicing of *-c-* to *-g-*; cf. e.g., *Drogus* for *Drōcus* of the year 697 (*Romania*, XXXI, 235); also the inverse *prolocus* for *prologus* in a continuator of Fredegarius (*Roman. Forsch.*, X, 864).

² *Romania*, XIV, 158: "chute ou vocalisation très ancienne de la consonne précédant l'*u*, ce qui produit une diphtongue composée de la tonique et de l'*u*." Paris thus remained uncertain as to whether or not *-g-* "fell," and, like Schwan-Behrens and most others, he did not confine this "chute ou vocalisation" to the inflected forms. The latter idea seems at one time to have occurred to Meyer-Lübke, for he asked (*Zeit. f. rom. Phil.*, XI, 541): "Sind *feu* u. s. w. die alten Nominativformen?" To justify the answer "yes" to this question was the purpose of my Philadelphia paper, 1894. Provençal, to judge from *sec*, *siec*, *sēquit*, knows nothing of this "vocalisation."

³ A somewhat miscellaneous collection of material was made by Ulbrich, *Zeit. f. rom. Phil.*, II, 536. The matter is treated with more acumen by Meyer-Lübke, *ibid.*, XI, 541.

⁴ Possibly also (*r*); *sieure sēquēre*, *QLR*, 387, would then be "regular." The small group *eue aqua*, *iue ōqua*, *siue sēquam*, where the sonorous *-a* seems to take the place of the dental, deserves a separate study; for this the materials are ready at hand in the two dissertations, Brand, 1887; *Studien zur Geschichte von inlautendem qu in Nordfrankreich*, and Frademann, 1904; *Die Entwicklung der latein. Lautverbindung qu im Französischen*. The latter is especially useful. For *aqua* see Fr. Hürlimann's *Die Entwicklung von lat. aqua in den romanischen Sprachen*, 1903.

⁵ This is Paris' etymon (*Romania*, XXII, 617; adopted also by Nyrop) and it seems to me irrefragable. Sheldon, *Harvard Studies and Notes*, I, 121, derived OF *site* from *sēcta* (whence *suite*, on the analogy of *suivre*); but OF *site* now appears as merely the reduced form of *siute*, this in turn a variant of *sieute*. Eng. *suit* is, of course, OF *siute*, the western form, with the later spelling as in *suivre*; cf. the Anglo-Norman *luis* for *lius*, mentioned below.

⁶ Suchier, § 32, c; the *QLR* have *lieu* (29 times) and *liu* (18 times). The *loeus*, quoted by Matzke from Goerlich's *Northwestern Dialects*, p. 48, is of the late thirteenth century and therefore negligible; it seems to be a fusion of *lous* and *leus*, as divergent spellings or forms.

the peculiar sequence dental-velar-palatal-velar-dental, we perceive, with Mr. Tuttle, that it is a distinctly uncomfortable group; central Fr. substituted for it, if I am correct, the easier OF sequence (*ieu-s*) which was just then developing in the large list of words of the type *tu sieus sēquis*, *cieus caecus*, *estrieus*, *fieus*, *fēodu-, *sieute*, *trieue*, *tieule*, also in *Grieus Graecus*, *Juieus*, *Mathieus*, *Andrieus*, and others as listed by Suchier, § 32a. To avoid **lueus*, **luous* seems to have passed directly to *lieus*. This, in my view, was no phonetic shift of (*u*) to (*i*), to which Mr. Tuttle so vigorously objects, nor an ordinary dissimilation as Meyer-Lübke explains it, nor yet an evidence of (*ū*) in the diphthong (*ue*): it was an out-and-out substitution by analogy to the large *cieus*-group. It has several parallels. In central French we have the later substitution of *tieus* for older *teus* talis, *pieus* for *peus* palus, *Dieus* for *Deus* (see Suchier, *Voyelles toniques*, § 61). Note that this is a Francian, almost a Parisian, phenomenon. The Picard dialect gives an inordinate extension to this (*ieu*), for we find it in *fieus filius*, in *ententieus*, and even in the participles like *eslieus* (for *esleūs*). There is a third and even closer parallel, as has often been pointed out, in the much later series *suell* sōlet *sueut*, Pic. *sieut*, Champ. *siaut*, and cf. the oft-debated *ueuz*, later *ieus*, now *yeux*.

We had, therefore, very early *lieus* and *gieus*. How stood it with *fōgus*, and *cōgus* from cōquus?

The occasional fall of (*u*) after labial consonant is now pretty well assured for OF. Suchier explained *moi* mōdium of the Cassel Glosses as for regular **muoi*, normally later **muei*, *mui*, now *muid*. OF *mōle* mōla (in rhyme in Garnier) would represent the ancient *muōle*, normally *muele* as in *Domesday Book*. In my opinion, *foire fōria*¹ also dates from the period of **fuqria*, just as *feire* is a similar reduction of **fueire* (*Mod. Phil.*, X, 448). So *ferre* G. fōdr in Wace and Villon is to be similarly explained (Meyer-Lübke, *Hist. Frz. Gram.*³, § 98). At the stage *fuqus* a reduction (not necessarily universal) to *fous* was certainly to be expected, and this I (and others) believe leads us to *fou* of the Pic.-Wall. *Ste.-Eulalie* (a new obl. from the nom.) and to *fous* of *Roland*, 3912, 3917. In *cōgus*, *cuous* then *cueus*, the loss of (*u*) after (*k*) is also currently assumed, by Suchier and Meyer-Lübke among others; and it is easy to understand. The doublet OF *cointe* and *cueinte* cōgnitu Eng. *quaint* gives us a trustworthy parallel. Hence the *cous* of the *Roland*, 1817, and if elsewhere, as in the oldest *Lapidary* and in the *Roman de Thèbes*, we find *lous* and *jous*, these will be due to the analogy of *fous*, *cous*. It is in fact quite possible that all, or nearly all, of the bewildering variety of forms found in the territory of the ancient Lugdunensis will derive in the first instance from one or the other of these two prototypes: *lieus*, *gieus* on the one hand or *fous*, *cous* on the other.

¹ The assumption of (*ō*) in *fōria* by A. Thomas (*Romania*, XXXI, 490) seems to me rather arbitrary; cf. the ancient doublet *fors* and *fuer*. As to *fors*<*fōris*, the received theory of atonic development is not in the least inconsistent with the theory here advanced: *fuqrs*>*fōrs*, the extrusion of (*u*) being favored by atonic position.

Wace's *lēus* (: *Deus*), for example, is a by-form of *lieus*, showing a reduction parallel to Garnier's *fēre* for *fiere* fēra. Marie de France, on the other hand, aside from the *focus*, *cocus* pair, which do not occur in rhyme, has (*iu*) consistently: *lius* (assured already in the *St. Brandan* by the rhyme *lius:pius* *pius*), *cius*, *Juius* (cf. *Espurg.*, 133, 1915), and from these western forms we have in Eng., as we should expect, *curlew*, *curfew*, the proper names *Kew* (*coquus*), *Jew*, *Andrew*, *Grew* (*Graecus*? or *crōcus*, Prov. *gruec*?) *Drew* *Drōcus*, *Hebrew*, and others. By extrusion of (*u*) between high-front vowel and dental (*s*) we may pass from *lius* to *lis*, cf. *milli* and *gi* instanced by Eggert from the Norman patois (Zf RP, XIII, 373), also forms like *corlis* (NED), *site* for *siute*, which show the same change as *aît* from *aiut* (Paris, *Mélanges linguistiques*, p. 570).

Another secondary formation, from *lius* apparently, is that in *lūs*, *jūs*, *fūs* (Gautier d'Arras, *Brut* of Munich, *Adam*, etc.) in which (*iu*) passes to (*ü*), probably by fusion. As to A-N *luis*, which Menger (§ 26) rightly refused to regard as merely an inverse spelling, it is rather from *lius*, as *suit* from *siut*, *suis* (whence the obl. *suif*) from *sius*, by metathesis of the elements of this very unstable diphthong.

Similarly, reduction of the forms *fous*, *lous* may be expected to furnish at times a nom. *fos*, *los*, obl. *fo*, *lo* as we do in fact find assured by rhyme in the fableau *Des Tresces* (Bartsch-Horning, 622, 33; cf. 621, 22; 303, 30).

Crestien de Troyes, while he has *po p a u c u* (from obl. pl. *pqs* for *pqus*?) shows the series *feu*, *leu*, *jeu*: do these derive from the type *fous*, or from the type *lieus*?

As to Crestien's forms I do not profess to be at all clear, but the following considerations may be offered. As *lupus* *lous* does not pass in Crestien to *leus* (cf. *los:ros* Erec, 4412, *los:ros* Yvain, 301) as it does elsewhere (note the interesting reduction nom. pl. *li lé*, *Auc. et Nic.*, 17, 8) and as *pous* does not pass to *peus*; as the (*ieu*) series appear in Crestien as (*eu*): *Greus* and *seut* *sequit* (Foerster's *siut* is questionable), there would seem to be more justification in connecting the Champagne *leus* with the older *lieus*, the triphthong (*ieu*) being apparently foreign to this region; so also *seut* in the contemporary eastern *Dial. An. et Rat.*, and in the *Sermons* of St. Bernard, *Eructavit*, 1016 (Frademann, *op. cit.*, pp. 47-48). At the same time it may be observed that the reduction to *po* may be later than a possible passage of *fous* to *feus*; the former may be contemporary with the twelfth-century *cōls cōllu-s* *cous* then *cos*, *vōls* **vōlsi* *vous* then *vos*. Moreover, Crestien does not show an unbroken series in (*eu*): he has *estriers* for *estrieus*, so that the situation is mixed.

Still another OF derivative of *lōcus* awaits mention. Benoît, aside from *lieus* and *gieus* (assured by the rhyme :*cieus* *caelos*), which are central French, has the puzzling rhyme *fués* *fōcus*:*bués* *bōves* *Roman de Troie*, I, 95, noted by Suchier, p. 99. The rare if not unique *fuēu* of Sanson de Nanteuil indicates that the loss of (*u*) after (*f*) was not necessarily

universal: Benoît's *fués* seems to be from *fueus* by extrusion of the second (*u*) after high-front (*e*) before (*s*). This constant recourse to "extrusion" of (*u*) I should perhaps be at some pains to justify; but it is ancient and well authenticated in Latin and Romance. Very old is *Ulixes* from dialectal 'Ολυσσεύς (Lindsay, *Lat. Spr.*, p. 326); to explain *Pharisee* in Eng. we must start from *Pharisés* for *Phariseos* (Sweet, *Collected Papers*, p. 189); Benoît hesitates between *Idomenés* and *Idomeneus*, *Partonopés* and *Partonopeus*, just as Crestien does between *Grés* and *Greus*, *Kés* (the seneschal) and *Keus*.¹ The phenomenon deserves a separate study; it occurs, as Suchier remarked, here and there in almost all the domain of the langue d'oïl (*Auc. et Nic.*⁵, § 17). Confronted then with the unmanageable *lueus* (see above), there were two ways out: one might pass to *lieus* on the one hand, or to *lués* on the other. Just how genuine and how widespread this latter form is, remains to be determined. In any case one is tempted to derive from it as a nominative the obl. *luec*, on the analogy of the pairs *ses siccus*, obl. *sec*, *sas-sac*, *cos-coc*, *bes-bec*. When, however, we consider the state of affairs in a late mediaeval Poitevin text like the *Regle dou Temple* (ed. Curzon), where one may count fifteen instances of *luec*, with *fuec* once, *cuec* and *cuecq*, but also *leuc* four times, *leu* twice, *feu* twice, it seems quite possible that these *luec*-forms may be due to a nom. *leus*.² No one, however, seems ready to derive the *luec*-forms from the Lat. accus. *lōcu*, late VL *lōgo*. Mr. Tuttle will not even admit them as original in Provençal: they are "rejected of men." Such a theory, indeed, must have occurred to many, but strongly against it is the fact that we have (*i*) from (*g*) in countless place-names in -*acu* -*ago*, -*ai* (Bavai, Cambrai), in person-names like *DuFay* *fagu*, and especially in *paugo* from which we should expect *poi*. For *poi* is as good OF as *pou*, *peu* or *po*, and must, I am convinced, derive from *paugo* or *paugi*, or preferably from both: Prov. *pauc d'home saubon*, Fr. *poi d'home sevent* could hardly originate otherwise than from either *paucu* or *pauci*, the uninflected forms. The continuation of Lat. *lōcum*, whatever it was, disappeared too early to be recorded in any text now known.

Still to be mentioned is the adv. *lués*, found frequently in rhyme with *ués* opus. Here we are free from the question of cases, and the flexional -s can make no disturbance. Again Meyer-Lübke's suggestion seems to

¹ Interesting is the problem of the two forms of the name of the Seneschal Sir Kay, but, while the doublet *Keu-Kai* is similar to some of those mentioned in this article, it is probable that the two cases are entirely unconnected. Has it been noted that J. Rhys, *Lectures on Welsh Philology* (pp. 29, 223-24, 390), finds in inscriptions a Celtic name *Iccavos*, *Cauo*, from which he says *Caus* and *Cais*, *Ceis* are possible derivatives? Does *Keus* continue *Caus* as *sarquus* < **sarquagus*? We may at least be sure that the form *Coi* or *Koi* (*Erec*, 1972: *soi* and often in *Fergus*) is merely the eastern adaptation of western *Kei* = *Kai*.

² Constans eliminated the peculiar *fués* from his text (*Troie*, 1887-88) but had his doubts (see the later Vol. VI, 123). In his text of the *Roman de Thèbes*, 2193-94, by the way, a correction is to be made: the rhyme is not *seis siccus* : *mareis*, but *ses* : *marés*, this last being a well-known variant of *mareis*.

me the correct one (*Hist. Frz. Gram.*³, § 190, end): in *lōco* and **ilōco* (CL ilico) the -c- was never voiced to -g-, the word rhymed early with *hōc*, and hence appeared in OF as *luec*, rhyming with *avuec*, *poruec*, *senuec*. As to *lués*, it stands to this *luec* as *ains* to *ainc*, *dons* to *donc*, -c disappearing as usual before the adverbial -s.

Finally, mod. Fr. *jeu* for older *gieu* (we find *gieus* in rhyme with *vieus* *vētulus* and *tieus* as late as the *Cent Ballades*) exhibits the same normal reduction as OF *abregier* to *abréger*.—T. A. JENKINS.]